

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the title, Abstract and claims 1-3, 6, 10, 14, 16 and 17 are amended. Claims 3 and 14 are amended for form. Support for the amendments to claims 1-3, 6, 10, 14, 16 and 17 can be found at least in Figs. 6, 19, 20 and 24 and the corresponding description in the specification, for example, at page 12, lines 11-33 and page 13, lines 7-15. No new matter is added.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to the Applicants' representatives by Examiners McClain and Mackey in the August 2, 2007 interview. Applicants separate record of the substance of the interview regarding this issue is incorporated into the following remarks.

**I. May 23, 2007 Information Disclosure Statement**

An Information Disclosure Statement with Form PTO-1449 was filed in the above-captioned patent application on May 23, 2007. Applicants have not yet received from the Examiner a copy of the Form PTO-1449 initialed to acknowledge the fact that the Examiner has considered the disclosed information. The Examiner is requested to initial and return to the undersigned a copy of the Form PTO-1449. For the convenience of the Examiner, a copy of that form is attached.

**II. The Abstract Satisfies Formal Requirements**

The Abstract is objected to for being more than 150 words. This objection is respectfully traversed.

By this Amendment, the Abstract is amended to be less than 150 words. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the Abstract satisfies all formal requirements. Withdrawal of the objection is thus respectfully respected.

**III. The Title is Descriptive**

The title is objected to for not being descriptive. This objection is respectfully traversed.

By this Amendment, the title is amended to recite "SHEET PACKAGE INCLUDING SIDE PARTS FOR A PRINTER." Applicants respectfully submit that the title is descriptive. Withdrawal of the objection is thus respectfully requested.

**IV. The Claims Satisfy All Formalities**

Claims 1, 3, 6, 10, 14, 16 and 17 are objected to for informalities. These objections are respectfully traversed.

With respect to claims 1, 16 and 17, the Office Action asserts that "having," should be "has." By this Amendment, claims 1, 16 and 17 are amended to recite "the side part being in parallel with the sheet feed direction and having a front edge and a rear edge."

With respect to claim 3, the Office Action asserts that "so that" should be "such that." By this Amendment, claim 3 is amended accordingly.

With respect to claims 6 and 10, the Office Action generally asserts that the phrasing of claims 6 and 10 is not clear. By this Amendment, claims 6 and 10 are amended to provide antecedent basis for the parts of the side par and for form with respect to the comparison of lengths.

With respect to claim 14, the Office Action asserts that "removal of" should be "removing." By this Amendment, claim 14 is amended accordingly.

Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1, 3, 6, 10, 14, 16 and 17 satisfy all formal requirements. Withdrawal of the objections is thus respectfully requested.

**V. Claims 1-17 Satisfy the Requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph**

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claims 1, 16 and 17, the Office Action asserts that "spreading in parallel" is unclear. During the August 2 interview, the Examiners agreed that substituting "spreading in parallel" with "being in parallel" would obviate this rejection. By this Amendment, claims 1, 16 and 17 are amended accordingly.

The Office Action also asserts that "its," and "letting" as recited in claims 1, 16 and 17, are unclear. By this Amendment, these phrases are cancelled and thus this assertion is moot.

The Office Action finally asserts that "in regard to," as recited in claims 1, 16 and 17, should be "relative to." By this Amendment, claims 1, 16 and 17 are amended accordingly.

With respect to claim 3, the Office Action asserts that it is unclear what structure is cut or not cut and who is cutting it. By this Amendment, claim 3 is amended to recite that the side part only includes uncut portions. Applicants respectfully assert that uncut portions are defined in the specification, for example, at page 10, lines 11-17.

With respect to claim 6, the Office Action asserts that, it is unclear to what "side part" is referred. Further, with respect to claims 6 and 10, the Office Action asserts that the overall phrasing of claims 6 and 10 is unclear. By this Amendment, claims 6 and 10 are amended as discussed above.

Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that independent claims 1, 16 and 17, and claims 2-15 depending from claim 1, satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

**VI. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter**

Claims 1-5, 9 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 4,494,746 to Moser; claims 1-4, 9 and 13-17 as rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0056961 A1 to Sasaki et al. (Sasaki); claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Moser in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,217,019 B1 to Ishiduka et al.; claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sasaki in view of Ishiduka; claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Moser in view of Ishiduka; and claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sasaki in view of Ishiduka. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As agreed upon during the personal interview, neither Moser nor Sasaki teaches or suggests a package member having a side part wherein the side part includes a portion that is attached to the package member at a first position and is separated from the package member at a second position, as recited in independent claims 1 and 16.

Moser merely discloses a cassette 1 that has adjacent parts of the bottoms side, the upper side, and two lateral sides that are left free as shown in Fig. 5 (Moser, col. 3, lines 3-16). Moser does not include portions that separate from the cassette. Thus, Moser does not teach or suggest the claimed side part.

Furthermore, Sasaki merely discloses a packaging case 11 as shown in Fig. 4. The packaging case 11 of Sasaki merely includes cutouts that are in a detached position. The packaging case 11 of Sasaki does not have a side part that includes a portion that is attached at a first position and separated at a second position. Thus, Moser does not teach or suggest the claimed side part.

Regarding claim 17, the Examiners agreed that neither Moser nor Sasaki teaches or suggests a printer system that has package member including a side part wherein the side part is structured such that the front edge contacts the projecting part and the side edge of the stack

of sheets is in flush contact with the projecting part in accordance with the placement of the package member in the sheet storage unit relative to the sheet feed direction.

Moser discloses an apparatus that includes an arm 4, which extends into the sheets, as shown in Figure 3 (Moser, col. 3, lines 40-62). That is, the arm 4 penetrates the stack of sheets 9, thus is not in flush contact with the stack of sheets. Thus, Moser does not teach or suggest the claimed printer system.

Furthermore, Sasaki merely discloses guiding projections 50-53 that contact the recording sheets. However, as disclosed by Sasaki at paragraphs [0087] and [0088], the width between the opposing guiding portions is greater than the width of the recording sheets, and accordingly does not make flush contact with the stack of sheets and contact with the front edge of a side part. Thus, Sasaki does not teach or suggest the claimed printer system.

Furthermore, Ishiduka does not remedy the deficiencies of Moser and Sasaki. Ishiduka is merely relied on by the Office Action for its alleged teaching of a mark and length of side part.

Thus, for at least these reasons, independent claims 1, 16 and 17 are patentable over the applied references. Further, claims 2-15, which depend from claim 1, are also patentable over the applied references for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejections is thus respectfully requested.

## **VII. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs  
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:JDS/jnm

Date: August 10, 2007

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--